

SECRET
Security Information

4966
AUG 21 1953

MEMORANDUM FOR: Acting Deputy Director (Administration)

SUBJECT: General Cabell's Proposal on Personnel Organization

1. We have given consideration to the papers you asked us to review which originated with General Cabell. As Mr. Maloon pointed out to you on the evening of 19 August 1953, we find it extremely difficult to make concrete comparisons and comments on the organization suggested without being better informed on contemplated delegation of responsibilities to the remainder of the organization. As an example, we find no statement of responsibilities for the organizational block entitled "CH/PER" under DD/P. As a further example, we can only conjecture the remaining portions of the DD/A organization.

2. We offer the following comments on the functional statement prepared by General Cabell. Our comments are made in the order in which they appear on General Cabell's write-up.

a. We agree the Personnel Office should be responsible for the procurement of personnel.

b. We agree the Personnel Office should recommend the establishing of overall Agency policies relating to personnel. We recognize that all such policies should be established in concert with operating offices and their recommendations.

c. "To ascertain and maintain records of personnel recruitments" is lacking in specifics as to precisely what is meant. On one hand, it could mean requisitions for people; on the other hand, it could mean maintenance of personnel files. We see no need of maintaining records concerned with covert personnel in the DD/P area except for some contract and field agents. Such latter records are presently maintained in some instances by individual case officers on the "need to know" theory. For this reason, we question the advisability of a central file of such records. Staff agent files, however, are different in that the employee involved has in most instances been a former staff employee. In these cases, all such records are maintained in pseudonym as a security device.

d. We agree the Personnel Office should be involved in the reassignment of returnees. Staff agents, however, are not generally reassigned as such. Generally they revert from staff agent to staff employee when their particular assignment is completed.

~~SECRET~~
Security Information

g. "To provide personal services such as welfare, medical, security, morale" implies that the Medical and Security Offices as they now exist would be combined under one organization to be known, presumably, as the Personnel Office. Such an arrangement could work and we assume the reasoning behind such functionalization is to bring about greater coordination in this homogeneous group. At one time the Medical Office was under the Personnel Office. It is our understanding that it was made a separate office when the medical staff began to interest itself in operational medical problems. If the Medical Office is to continue such function and the Security Office is to continue in the field of operational and physical security, then it appears that the aim to get "people" together is somewhat nullified.

f. "To develop and supervise an adequate Career Service System" indicated that the thinking may be that the present CIA Career Service System, as such, would be abolished or at least that it would continue under more active direction by the head of the personnel function. As we have stated previously, there is no question but that the objectives of the Personnel Office should be exactly the same as that of the CIA Career Service Board.

g. The Personnel Office should continue to operate an incentive awards system. This item indicates that some thought has been given to combining honor awards with incentive awards.

h. Maintenance of efficiency records of the Agency is certainly a personnel function and our Personnel Evaluation Reports represent the nearest document we have to an efficiency report.

i. We agree we should assist in the development of T/O's and to slot people against approved T/O's.

j. The "classification determination unit" is presumed to be the Classification & Wage function. We agree this should be a Personnel Office function.

k. We agree the Personnel Office should maintain personnel strength and satisfy personnel needs. This item is apparently an elaboration on Item 1.

l. We agree that the Personnel Office should make recommendations on T/O's. This item is a further amplification of Item 9.

m. The Training and Rotation Group suggests a Replacement Training Center. We doubt that all incoming new employees should be assigned to this group. We see no objection to having IAB clericals and other new people report to this group if it is a

matter of holding them for clearance or other than specialized training. We have mixed feelings on operating one central reassignment group. Our principal objection to such a device is the inclination to dump undesirables into such a group or marginal employees on whom an office is not willing or able to substantiate separation action. With proper understanding of the group's purpose, however, this objection could be eliminated.

3. The paragraph entitled "Special Arrangements" is not clear. For quite some time the files on DD/P staff agents and staff employees have not been maintained in the DD/P area. As mentioned above, we maintain staff agent files in pseudonym. Staff employee files are kept in true name. Under our new organization, a secure unit will be provided in the Personnel office to maintain the type security such files demand and the actions affecting such individuals. If providing file and desk space to work on staff agents is the only reason for the existence of the Chief of Personnel, DD/P, then it appears to us there is no reason for the organizational segment.

4. To recapitulate, we view General Cabell's proposal as an obvious attempt to consolidate under one direction all offices dealing with people. Due to the absence of specifics, we recognize we may be in error in this assumption. In general, we feel it may be argued there is definite advantage to having the DCI and the DDCI more closely associated with those functions involving people. On the other hand, to do so increases the supervisory responsibilities of the DCI and the DDCI to give day to day guidance to the organization. This cannot help but reduce the effectiveness of those individuals to the rest of the Agency unless the responsibility is delegated to lesser individuals on the DCI staff. If the responsibility is so delegated, then the intent is somewhat negated. While we might like to feel we have the Director's immediate ear on some of our problems, we cannot honestly say that we have suffered irreparably in our relations thus far as a part of the DD/A organization. Whether the Director feels he needs to be closer to Personnel and its problems, we have not been told. In an organization of this size, there is a great need for close coordination of administrative and housekeeping elements in accomplishing their mission of supporting operations. Since we are somewhat on the periphery on the effectiveness of this coordination we cannot say whether it is generally regarded as adequate. We view the DD/A function as the equivalent of an administrative Chief of Staff. If the present DD/A function were to be split, it immediately raises the question of the necessity for a corresponding Chief of Staff at a higher level so as to effect the coordination of the administrative and service functions involved and relieve the Director of this responsibility.

5. General Cabell's material is returned herewith.